

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application.

Claim 9 stands rejected as being anticipated by US 6,540,479 to Liao et al. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection of claim 9 is traversed.

The axial-flow fan with double impellers defined in claim 9 includes a first fan unit having a first case and a second fan unit having a second case. The first case has a first impeller disposed in a suction opening thereof while the second case has a second impeller disposed in a discharge opening of the second case. The first and second cases are coupled to one another by a coupling structure that includes first and second kinds of engaged portions provided on the first case and first and second kinds of engaging portions provided on the second case. The first kind of engaged portions and the first kind of engaging portions cooperate to define a first kind of engaging structure that is adapted to resist an axial separation of the first and second cases and rotation of the first case relative to the second case in one of two rotational directions. The second kind of engaged portions and the second kind of engaging portions cooperate to define a second kind of engaging structure that is adapted to resist rotation of the first case relative to the second case in the opposite or second of two rotational directions. It is respectfully submitted that Liao does not teach or suggest the invention defined in claim 9.

Liao teaches an assembly including first and second impellers or rotors (20, 30) and first and second stators (40, 50). The first and second impellers are disposed in the first stator (Col. 2, lines 39-44).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Liao does not teach or suggest:

a first axial-flow fan unit comprises: a first case including therein an air channel having a suction opening portion on one of axial-end sides thereof and a discharge opening portion on the other axial-end side thereof, and **a first impeller having a plurality of blades and being adapted to rotate in the suction opening portion**; and

a second axial-flow fan unit comprises: a second case including therein an air channel having a suction opening portion on one of axial-end sides thereof and a discharge opening portion on the other axial-end side thereof, and **a second impeller having a plurality of blades and being adapted to rotate in the discharge opening portion**;

(emphasis added)

Rather, Liao teaches that the first and second impellers (rotors 20, 30) are disposed within the air channel of a single case (i.e., stator 40), contrary to the arrangement defined in claim 9. Further, even if the second impeller (rotor 30) is considered to be disposed within the air channel of the second case (i.e., stator 50), it is clear that the second impeller (rotor 30) is disposed in the suction opening of the second case (stator 50), rather than the discharge opening of the second case. (See Figs. 2, 7 and 9). Accordingly, regardless of how Liao is interpreted, it is clear that Liao does not teach the arrangement of the impellers (rotors) relative to the cases (stators) defined in claim 9.

Further, with regard to the first and second engaging structures, the Examiner has cited Liao's insertions 44 and recesses 53 as teaching the first kind of engaging structure, and the lugs 42 and holes 52 as teaching the second kind of engaging structure. It is respectfully submitted that this determination or conclusion is in error.

According to claim 9, the first kind of engaging structure is adapted to resist axial separation of the first and second cases as well as resist rotation of the first case relative to the second case in a first direction. In contrast, Liao's first engaging structure (i.e., 53 and 44) does not resist axial separation of the first and second

cases.

Accordingly, for this further reason it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined in claim 9 is patentable over the cited Liao patent.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 based upon this reference is hereby requested.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected as being unpatentable over US 6,799,942 to Tzeng et al. in view of US 6,565,334 to Bradbury et al.

The Tzeng patent issued October 5, 2004, and was based upon an application filed September 23, 2003. The present application was filed on June 30, 2004 as a national stage of a PCT application. The PCT application (PCT/JP2003/05468) was filed on April 28, 2003, and claims priority to two Japanese applications, both of which were filed on March 13, 2003. It is respectfully submitted that the effective filing date of the present application is April 28, 2003 (the filing date of the PCT application) and, accordingly, the Tzeng patent is not a reference against the present application. As such, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 is considered to be moot. There being no further rejections of claims 1-8, it is submitted that these claims are in a condition for allowance.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. NIS-15538.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By


David E. Spaw, Reg. No. 34732

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700